



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

evidence of the consummation of such changes, and until this evidence is supplied this Government is unable to perceive that there is any proper basis for considering trade relations.

Secretary of Commerce Hoover, whose advice on this problem has been weighty in enabling the Secretary of State to act summarily and consistently, commenting upon the above communication, said:

Secretary Hughes' statement shows the complete agreement in the views of the whole administration. As a matter of trade, the first thing to be determined about Russia is if and when they change their economic system.

If they so change its basis as to accept the right of private property, freedom of labor, provide for the safety of human life, etc., there is hope of the recovery from the miseries of famine; there is hope of a slow recovery in production and the upbuilding of trade.

Nothing is more important to the whole commercial world than the recovery of productivity in Russia. However, without a fundamental change in their whole economic system, there will be no consequential trade or production and no stoppage of continuous degeneration.

PROTEST OF THE NATIONAL CIVIC FEDERATION

The attitude of the conservative elements of the population of the United States toward any plan to recognize the Soviet Government is fairly indicated by the correspondence which follows:

THE NATIONAL CIVIC FEDERATION, TWENTY-THIRD FLOOR,
METROPOLITAN TOWER, NEW YORK, *March 24, 1921.*

HON. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am inclosing a copy of resolutions adopted by a vote of 558 to 2 at a meeting held under the auspices of the National Civic Federation in New York City, January 13, 1921.

These resolutions have since been approved in writing by men and women representing all classes of our citizenry and all sections of the United States, a partial list being herewith enclosed.

May I also call your attention to a petition against the recognition of the Bolshevik Government of Russia by the United States, which was filed with your predecessor under date of April 17, 1920?

Very sincerely yours,

ALTON B. PARKER,
President.

The text of the resolution follows:

In view of the country-wide campaign of falsehood and misrepresentation by Bolshevik sympathizers to bring about the recognition of the Soviet Government of Russia, and realizing the immoral character and harmful effects of such an act, we declare:

(1) That we are opposed to granting official recognition to an organization whose avowed purpose is the undermining and overthrow of stable government and democratic institutions throughout the world, to which purpose it is devoting the wealth plundered from the Russian people.

(2) That we denounce the attempt to legalize by governmental recognition these acts of plunder, the proceeds of which are used in part for Bolshevik propaganda in this country.

(3) That we repudiate any policy whereby, under the pretext of improving commercial relations, our country would become a party to robbing the starving Russian people of their last remaining resources in order to enrich the usurpers in Russia and unscrupulous speculators abroad.

(4) That we commend the vigorous and far-sighted policy with respect to Soviet Russia expressed by the Secretary of State in his note of August 10. We are confident that America will put forth her full efforts to aid in all ways possible the resurrection of Russia when the Communist terror shall

have given place to a government of, for, and by the Russian people.

Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Civic Federation pledges itself to support the incoming Administration in its resistance against the sinister commercial interests and fomenters of social unrest, who, by urging trade relations with the Soviet régime or direct recognition of it, are working together to perpetuate the chaos into which Russia has been plunged by Lenin and Trotzky.

PRO-RUSSIAN ADVOCATES

Senators France, of Maryland, and Borah, of Montana, are leaders of a group in the Senate that intend to raise the issue of recognition of Russia by the United States and compel a debate on the policy set forth by Secretaries Colby and Hughes. The point of view of Senator Borah is reflected in the following quotation from an interview:

If we are to obtain our full share of Russian trade, it is high time we did something. I have thought for many months that we ought to establish complete trade relations with Russia instead of falling behind Great Britain. We should have led the way, as a matter of fact, and have been the first to avail ourselves of the urgent need of the Russian people for the things we make and produce.

It is no answer to say that Russia or the Russian people are not in a position at this time to engage in extensive trade relations with any other nation. By establishing complete trade relations with the Russians, we can do much to readjust world economic and trade conditions and bring about normal conditions in foreign affairs.

I am particularly interested in our doing this at this time, and I, for one, expect to remind the Senate, when it meets, of the possibilities of a situation which the late Administration deliberately and blindly overlooked.

Great Britain has merely done what we anticipated months ago. It is not too late for us to correct the errors committed by the Wilson Administration in dealing with the Russian people. The establishment of complete trade relations between the United States and Russia is demanded by the situation as it exists today, just as it was demanded by the situation as it existed yesterday, and I hope something will be done so that we will not have to sit idly by any longer while another nation like Great Britain goes in and reaps the benefit of the Russian market.

THE UNITED STATES, THE ALLIES, AND YAP

First response to the letter of the United States to the Allies relative to equal rights on the Island of Yap was sent from France, April 7. The note said:

PARIS, *April 7, 1921.*

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the letter dated the fourth of this month by which your excellency was good enough to transmit to me a memorandum from the Department of State relative to the status of the Island of Yap.

Since this memorandum was sent simultaneously to the governments of Great Britain, Italy, and Japan, it cannot be answered until after an understanding has been reached between the governments of the four interested powers at the time of the next meeting of the Supreme Council of the Allies.

I wish, however, to inform your excellency at once that when this question comes before the Supreme Council the representatives of France will broach the examination thereof with the greatest desire to find a solution which will give every satisfaction to the United States.

As your excellency knows, the government of the republic has already done all in its power to lend its aid to the American Government in this matter. By a note dated February 18, after having noted that the decision of May 7,

1919, made no reserve concerning the mandate attributed to Japan over the islands of the northern Pacific, my department pointed out to your embassy that nevertheless President Wilson and Mr. Lansing had formulated in the course of a former meeting, in the presence of the representatives of Japan, categorical reservations concerning the Island of Yap; that Baron Makino had not objected; that the question raised by the representatives of the United States should be placed in discussion, and that consequently the Japanese Government was cognizant of the American reservations. The note concludes that thus there were elements for a resumption of conversations between the United States and Japan which the government of the republic would be happy to see result in a satisfactory conclusion.

This note was communicated on the same day to the embassy of Japan at Paris, and your excellency was good enough to express to my department your great satisfaction at this communication by giving the assurance that it would be particularly appreciated at Washington.

(Signed)

BRIAND.

Italy's Response

On April 29 Italy's ambassador to the United States handed to the State Department a note from his government, expressing substantial assent to the American note of April 5, which it had received at the same time that a similar note was sent to Great Britain, France, and Japan, relative to the equality of rights of mandatories in the Island of Yap. The text follows:

Italy is fully convinced that the United States is not asking for any privilege in the Island of Yap which is not equally granted to every other nation, including Japan. Italy is also convinced that the United States intends to protect its interest in the Island of Yap, with full consideration for the interest of other nations.

Italy therefore has not hesitated to express herself in a way which completely agrees with the text of the American note of the 5th of April inst. concerning the equality of right among mandatories in the exercise of their mandates.

Italy wishes and trusts that the just rights of everybody concerned be recognized always and everywhere in the Island of Yap, as well as in every other place and circumstance, with perfect equality and justice.

Italy seconded the Anglo-French proposal, which confided the study of the Yap question to the Juridical Committee and the conference of ambassadors in Paris, and she now expects that the conference will pronounce itself with equanimity in such a way as to eliminate every possibility of disagreement and to conciliate all conflicting interests.

Italy is particularly glad whenever the moral policies of the two governments and the material interests of the two nations agree in such a way as to put Italy and the United States in a position to co-operate toward the attainment of the common end, which consists in the realization of an era of serene peace and prosperity for the civilized world.

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS IN OIL

In harmony with the position of the United States, as defined in the note of November 20, 1920, to Great Britain (see *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, December, 1920), has been its attitude toward the government of Holland in its past and its pending legislation governing oil rights in its East Indian possessions, where the Standard Oil Company has been endeavoring, without success, in getting privileges conceded to British and Dutch "promoters." On April 29 the State Department gave out the text of correspondence which had passed between the American and Dutch governments. Following is the text of a communication from Minister Phillips to the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Netherlands:

EXCELLENCY: During the last twelve months I have on several occasions presented to Your Excellency the very great interest of my government in the participation by

American capital in the development of the mineral oil deposits of the Netherlands East Indies. With your approval, I have also had frequent interviews with the Minister of the Colonies on this same subject.

Insists on Equal Rights

On every occasion I have sought to impress upon the Government of the Netherlands that the real interest of the Government of the United States in these matters lies in the recognition of the principle of mutual or reciprocal accessibility to vital and natural resources by the nationals of the United States and by those of foreign countries, and the belief that the recognition of the principle of equal opportunity is the solution of the future oil problems throughout the world. I have pointed out that the United States has for years carried a burden of supplying a large part of the petroleum consumed by other countries, and that the petroleum resources of no other country have been so heavily drawn upon to meet foreign needs as the petroleum resources of the United States.

I have pointed out that in the future ample supplies of petroleum have become indispensable to the life and prosperity of my country as a whole, because of the fact that the United States is an industrial nation, in which distance renders transportation difficult, and agriculture depends largely on labor-saving devices using petroleum products.

In these circumstances my government finds no alternative than the adoption of the principle of equally good opportunity, with the proviso that no foreign capital may operate in public lands unless its government accords similar or like privileges to American citizens; and, furthermore, I have submitted that in the light of the future needs of the United States such very limited and purely defensive provisions as the above might become inadequate should the principle of equality of opportunity not be recognized in foreign countries.

During the month of January, 1921, I again had an opportunity to discuss the situation with Your Excellency, and on this occasion I advised you that in my interviews with the Minister of the Colonies I had gained the impression that the Colonial Department at least was inclined to favor the participation of American capital in the development of the Djambi fields. At the same time I advised you of the nature of the reports which I made to my government, in which I had dwelt upon the favorable attitude of the Colonial Department, and, furthermore, I asked whether the attitude of the Minister of Colonies represented in fact that of Her Majesty's Government.

Favorable Attitude Reiterated

You will recollect that on January 31 you were good enough to advise me that my impressions had been accurately reported to my government, and that I had not exaggerated the favorable attitude of the Colonial Department, which represented that of Your Excellency's Government.

I have now the honor to inform Your Excellency that I have received a telegram from the Secretary of State to the effect that the Government of the United States is still mindful of the assurances that have been given by you and by the Minister of Colonies relative to the favorable attitude of Her Majesty's Government toward American participation in the development of the Djambi fields. While I am not acting on behalf of any particular American company, I am glad of this opportune moment to point out that certain definite propositions which have been made during the last twelve months furnish sufficient evidence that responsible and experienced American interests are ready and desirous to co-operate with the Netherlands Government in oil developments in the Netherlands Indies.

It is, perhaps, needless to say that my government is fully aware of the laws and regulations in the Indies which prohibit foreign companies as such from entering the colonies for the development of mineral oils. On the other hand, my government is very greatly concerned when it becomes apparent that the monopoly of such far-reaching importance in the development of oil is about to be bestowed upon a company in which foreign capital other than American is so largely interested.

In this connection I desire most earnestly to divert to Your Excellency's attention the fact that American capital stands ready to assist in the development of the Djambi fields and other oil deposits in the Netherlands Indies.

In conclusion, I venture to say once more that my government attaches the highest importance to the recognition of the principles of the reciprocity and equal opportunity in the solution of the oil problems, as well as the extension to American capital, organized under Dutch law, of the same privileges and benefits which are granted to other foreign capital similarly organized under the laws of the Netherlands.

THE UNITED STATES AND IRELAND

During the presidential campaign the Republican candidate, Senator Harding, defined his attitude toward the claims of the Irish Republic for formal expression of sympathy by the United States Government in the following terms:

There are two phases of the so-called Irish question in America. Individual sentiment is one thing, and it is recognized that there is a widespread sympathy here for the cause of Irish independence. We voted an expression of that sympathy in the Senate at the time the peace delegates were conferring in Paris.

Official consideration is quite another thing. It is not a question for official America. America has already meddled abroad excessively without invitation. I have said, as I truly believe, that under the provisions of the League of Nations the Irish question is internal or domestic, and I recall distinctly that at the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the American advocates of Irish independence bitterly opposed the League as proposed, because it not only closed the door to Ireland, but committed us to the use of force to maintain territorial integrity as it exists today.

Notwithstanding this refusal to accept the point of view of American-Irish promoters of Irish independence, a majority of them are assumed to have voted for Mr. Harding in order to register opposition to the League of Nations.

On the 17th of March, known and celebrated in Boston as Evacuation Day, the issue again took acute form. Under authority vested in them, the commanders of the military and naval forces of the government stationed in and near Boston, who had been invited to order their forces to share in the customary parade, declined so to do because the managers of the parade were planning to give recognition to the Sinn Fein and "Freedom for India" movements. In this neutral attitude the local commanders were supported by Secretaries Weeks and Denby of the navy. Whereupon the following appeal to President Harding was sent by a representative of the Irish-Americans:

To President Harding:

General Ruckman and Admiral Dunn, in press statements today, say that to permit troops to march in partisan demonstrations, especially one unfriendly to another nation, would be a breach of international amity.

Evacuation Day, March 17, is a local demonstration of loyalty and patriotism that no devotee of Toryism, no matter how exalted his position, can stop. Are these officials Americans or satellites of foreign governments? Ruckman and Dunn asked the officials of the Evacuation Day parade if the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic intends to participate in the parade. When they were told "yes," they warned against the parading with them of men in United States uniform, whether in service or reservists. Are they autocrats or is this a democracy? They say no authority can revoke this decree.

It is for Washington to say whether they are supreme. As Americans we demand action in the name of 125,000 citizens of our State now and the revocation of orders from Ruckman and Dunn.

To this letter President Harding, after careful consideration and following consultation with the Cabinet, replied in the following terms:

Your telegram has been called to the attention of the President, and he directs me to say in reply that army and navy commanders have authority to direct the forces under their command. The government raises no issue about the fitness of your celebration of Evacuation Day, and the spirit of St. Patrick's Day is felt throughout our country, but the naval and military forces of the nation can have no part in any demonstration which may be construed as influencing the foreign relations of the Republic.

Comment of the independent press of the country on the incident has indicated marked approval of a decision calculated to assure maintenance of the forms of courtesy and order in Anglo-American relations.

AMERICAN RELIEF

On March 26 President Harding sent to the American Committee for the Relief of Ireland the following letter:

I wish you the fullest measure of success, not only at the great benefit performance at the Metropolitan Opera House on April 3, but in every worthy effort to make a becoming contribution on the part of our people to relieve distress among the women and children in Ireland. The people of America never will be deaf to the call for relief in behalf of suffering humanity, and the knowledge of distress in Ireland makes quick and deep appeal to the more fortunate of our own land where so many of our citizens trace kinship to the Emerald Isle.

DONAL O'CALLAGHAN FORCED TO RETURN

The petition of Donal O'Callaghan, who came to the United States as a stowaway, though being the Mayor of Cork, that he be allowed to remain in this country on the ground of his being a refugee, has been denied by Secretary Hughes. Thus he acquires the status of an alien seaman and must re-ship at an early date. He has been lecturing and speaking throughout the country, favoring the interests of the Irish republic.

Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, late in April, followed an extensive argument, favoring recognition of the Irish republic by the United States, with a resolution to that effect, which will call for square facing of the issue by the national legislators.

PANAMA, COSTA RICA, AND THE UNITED STATES

When we last went to press the State Department had just received from the Republic of Panama a communication the text of which will be found on page 116 of the March issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. It was suspected that it would draw from Secretary Hughes a prompt and unmistakable assertion by the United States that she expected the validity of arbitral awards to be accepted and enforced, and that further delay by Panama would not be looked upon with favor or with leniency.

On March 15 Panama was informed of the position of the United States, and the text of the communication was made